

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/812,901	ERICSON, PETTER
Examiner		Art Unit	
Mark Tremblay		2876	

All Participants:

(1) Mark Tremblay.

(2) Chad Billings.

Date of Interview: 8 June 2005

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☐ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Zhang/162.

Claims discussed:

1, 18, 19, 22-24

Prior art documents discussed:

'162, Zhang, Jackson, Petrie, etc.

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


MARK TREMBLAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature) _____ (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) _____

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413)

Application No. 09/812,901

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant asserted the final rejection was improper because, a) the rejection of claim 25 over Zhang in view of '162 was new, whereas claim 25 was not amended; and b) because Examiner had not properly addressed the "contrasting indicator" language in claims 18-19 and 22-24. Examiner agreed to consider these points, but was unable to determine during the interview whether the examiner fully agreed. Applicant and Examiner also traded views on the claims as a whole as they pertain to the disclosed invention and prior art..

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
Phone: (703) 205-8000
Fax: (703) 205-8050
(703) 698-8590 (G/V)

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Fax

*DRAFT - For Discussion Purposes
Only!*

To:	Le Thien Minh	From:	Chad Billings
Fax:	571-273-2396	Date:	August 8, 2005
Phone:	571-272-2396	Pages:	3 (including cover sheet)
Your Ref.:	09/812,901	Our Ref.:	3782-0128P
Re:		CC:	

☒ **Urgent** ☐ **For Review** ☐ **Please Comment** ☐ **Please Reply** ☐ **Please Recycle**

This transmission is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or duplication of this transmission by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited. If your receipt of this transmission is in error, please notify this firm immediately by collect call to (703) 205-8000, and send the original transmission to us by return mail at the address above.

Comments: DRAFT- FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSED ONLY!

Per our conversation earlier today, attached is a copy of the Interview Summary. Please note that claim 25 was unamended in our Response filed on October 4, 2004, however Mark rejected the claim 25 in view of a new reference (Zhang, US Pat No. 5,245,165), See page 4 of the Final Office Action. Also, as stated in interview summary, Mark did not consider the "contrasting indicator" feature in the claims in making his rejection in the Final Office Action. For these reasons applicants requested withdrawal of the finality of the office action and submission of a new office action including restarting the time period.

I look forward to discussing this with you next Monday. My direct line is 703-205-8001.

Best Regards,

Chad Billings

Interview Summary Attached